DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 597 EA 030 940

AUTHOR Ricciardi, Diane
TITLE Experiences of Kentucky Principal Intern Program Participants: Job Assistance Provided in the Entry Year.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Assistant Principals; *Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; *Internship Programs; *Job Development; *Mentors; Performance Factors; *Principals; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky

ABSTRACT

A study extended research on the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP) as it provides job-embedded development for new administrators through a 1-year mentoring and internship program. Subjects (N=97) were public school principals and assistant principals who were participating in KPIP in 1998-99. Survey research was used to collect data about job responsibilities, obstacles that hindered job adjustment, assistance provided by KPIP committee members, and recommendations for improving the KPIP process. Most principals entered their positions with little prior leadership experience, and many had fewer years as work experience and less formal preparation than did assistant principals. Results showed that both principals and assistant principals spent most of their time dealing with student discipline and supervision. During an average workday, few interns reported working on issues of curricular and instructional development. A primary obstacle that hindered job adjustment was the overwhelming job demands and time constraints facing new administrators during their entry year. Weaknesses in the interns' own backgrounds, along with volatile conflicts with faculty, hindered job adjustment and effectiveness. KPIP mentors assisted interns in areas of career and psychosocial assistance. Program activities most useful for interns involved professional feedback, resources and networking, self-reflection, and assistance in managing work demands. (Contains 24 references and tables.) (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: EXPERIENCES OF KENTUCKY PRINCIPAL INTERNS

Experiences of Kentucky Principal Intern Program Participants:

Job Assistance Provided in the Entry Year

Diane Ricciardi

University of Louisville

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the

American Educational Research Association,

April 24-28, 2000, New Orleans

ED 451 597

EA 030940

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Ricciardi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The study extends research on the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP) as it provides job-embedded development for new administrators through a one-year mentoring and internship program. Subjects (n = 97) were public school principals and assistant principals who were participating in KPIP in 1998-99. Survey research was used to collect data about job responsibilities, obstacles that hindered job adjustment, assistance provided by KPIP committee members, and recommendations for improving the KPIP process. Demographically, principal and assistant principal interns differed in several ways. Most principals entered their positions with little prior leadership experience, and many had fewer years work experience and less formal preparation than did assistant principals. Although interns were required to demonstrate competence on state administrator standards, study results show that both principals and assistant principals spent most of their time dealing with student discipline and supervision. During an average workday, few interns reported working on issues of curricular and instructional development. A primary obstacle that hindered job adjustment pertained to the overwhelming job demands and time constraints facing new administrators during their entry year. Additionally, weaknesses in the interns' own backgrounds, along with volatile conflicts with faculty members hindered job adjustment and effectiveness. KPIP mentors assisted interns in areas of career and psychosocial assistance. Program activities considered most useful for interns involved (a) professional feedback, (b) resources and networking, (c) self-reflection, and (d) assistance in managing work demands. Recommendations for improving KPIP focused on (a) increasing the quality and quantity of job performance feedback, (b) improving the process for matching formal mentors and interns, and (c) revising program mandates related to time requirements, performance expectations, and portfolio development. Study results serve to verify the value of mentoring, peer assistance, and intensive performance feedback for first-year administrators.

Experiences of Kentucky Principal Intern Program Participants:

Job Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors

Principals and assistant principals face unique challenges when they enter administration. Too often, they are shocked by differences between job expectations and job realities (Anderson, 1989). Administrators can be disadvantaged when they confront high-pressured job demands, while struggling to understand their new roles (Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). School leaders may be frustrated and anxious about their jobs and feel inadequate about their capacity to perform. New administrators commonly identify concerns regarding a) role clarification, b) technical expertise, and c) socialization to the profession (Daresh, 1986).

Even when administrators consider themselves well prepared, many lack formal leadership experiences because they enter administration directly from teaching positions. Although experiences as teachers may be helpful, major differences exist between the roles of classroom teachers and administrators (Daresh & Playko, 1989). Due to the complex nature of school leadership, the success of entry-level administrators may lie in their ability to engage in relevant development activities early in their administrative careers. At no time may support structures that extend administrators' job-embedded learning be more important than during the entry year.

Ideally, schools as work environments should help administrators expand their knowledge and skills. However, adult learning theorists (Knowles, 1988; Levine, 1982) contend that schools seldom accommodate the developmental needs of adult workers. Social learning theorists report that adults benefit from direct and observational learning experiences as they develop job behavior patterns and strengthen their personal expectations for successful work performance (Bandura, 1977). Components such as modeling and vicarious reinforcement have been used successfully to build both task-related and interpersonal skills of workers in various settings (Decker & Nathan, 1985).

Administrator job succession and induction research suggests that formal entry experiences such as internships and mentoring can help administrators succeed in the early years. Although common in preservice preparation, rarely do formalized experiences exist for practicing administrators. When

programs and activities do exist, they often are ill defined, poorly structured, and plagued by logistical issues of personnel costs and time constraints (Hart, 1993).

Although most mentoring research targets informal experiences, less agreement exists about benefits of formal experiences and the mentoring constructs that relate to administrator induction (Noe, 1988). General mentoring research reveals that experiences benefit individuals by providing two primary assistance functions to include (a) career, and (b) psychosocial assistance (Kram, 1985). Career assistance involves mentors working with protégés on specific job-related tasks that build protégé credibility with others and aid protégé career advancement. Psychosocial assistance involves mentors serving as role models, work counselors, and encouragers to increase protégé competence, professional identity, and work effectiveness. In researching school administrators, Playko (1990) reported that protégés gain confidence, self-awareness and management competence, and broaden their understanding about political contexts of schools and districts via interactions with mentors. Mentors generally report satisfaction in helping junior colleagues develop professionally and often discover that service as a mentor helps them redefine their own work through ongoing reflection shared with protégés.

One formal administrator induction model that incorporates both internship and mentoring is the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP). The state-mandated program is designed to provide support for first-year administrators (Prickette, et al., 1990). Created by the General Assembly in 1985, two KPIP goals exist: a) provide new administrator interns with the opportunity to learn from practicing professionals, and b) provide licensure based upon new administrator interns demonstrating the ability to meet state administrator standards (Kentucky Department of Education, 1999). Being the first of its kind in the nation, the program mandates formative growth activities that target professional development of principals and assistant principals during the entry year. Formative growth activities include 50 hours of contact with a principal mentor, along with observation and feedback cycles directed by a diverse three-member committee. All having administrative experience, a university professor, a superintendent or designee, along with a mentor principal serve on each KPIP intern's committee. During the year interns must demonstrate, through preparation of a portfolio and 27 hours of observations, that they have

addressed the state administrator standards (Kentucky Administrative Regulation 20:470; Kentucky Department of Education, 1997). A KPIP summative conference at year-end is used to determine the extension of each administrator intern's professional administrative license.

Although KPIP has existed for over a decade, only three studies were found pertaining to the program. The first two studies were program evaluation studies conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). In the first study covering two years, Petrie et al. (1992) identified demographic trends among administrator interns (n = 121) and reported positive benefits of KPIP participation. A second study reported that interns (n = 55) rated KPIP participation as the most beneficial requirement in preparing them for their current administrative positions (KDE, 1998). Most recently, in a dissertation study that utilized an instrument from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1988), Wells (1999) identified primary job duty profiles of interns, examined school, gender, and position-related differences, and explored changes in the nature of Kentucky administrators' work over three decades.

This descriptive study seeks to expand the research on the Kentucky Principal Intern Program by examining how KPIP activities provide assistance to administrators during the entry year. The study seeks to examine demographic trends, primary job responsibilities, and forms of job assistance provided by mentors, KPIP committee members, and others in the areas of career and psychosocial assistance. Finally, the study explores recommendations for improving the KPIP process and seeks to address several questions:

1. What are demographic characteristics and primary job responsibilities of administrator interns?
2. What obstacles hinder administrator interns' job adjustment during the entry year?
3. What forms of job assistance do administrator interns receive?
4. What recommendations do administrator interns give to improve the KPIP process?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Methodology

Population

All 1998-99 KPIP administrator interns (N= 176) representing traditional student populations were invited to participate in the study (see Table 1). Administrators serving at specialized schools like preschools, treatment centers, and vocational schools were excluded since the focus of the study was on traditional P-12 administrators. All participants were principals or assistant principals first appointed to administration in Kentucky during the 1998-99 year, and all were required to participate in KPIP. Study participants mirrored the general population of KPIP administrator interns in regards to school level and gender.

Insert Table 1 Here

Instrumentation

Self-reported data were collected in May 1999 using a survey questionnaire designed by the researcher. In addition to reviewing literature on administrative induction, job succession, and mentoring, the researcher examined the law (KRS 161.027) and the accompanying regulation (704 KAR 20:470) to analyze KPIP program requirements. Documents and prior research studies on KPIP were also reviewed (Kentucky Department of Education, 1999; Prickett, R. L., 1990; Wells, 1999.)

The survey instrument contained three sections, with the first used to collect data about participants' demographic characteristics including information about their positions, schools, and prior work experience. In the next section, fourteen items were used to collect data about job responsibilities. Of these items, thirteen were adapted from an instrument for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) (Doud & Keller, 1998), These items were designed by a panel of practitioners for the national study and represented key administrative job areas relevant for K-8 administrators. One additional area of administrative responsibility was added for this Kentucky study based upon recommendations of pilot study participants. Because Kentucky schools are required to have school-based

governance councils, "SBDM Council Responsibilities" was added as an item to the thirteen job responsibilities taken from the national study instrument. For this study, a total of 14 job responsibilities were listed to include management tasks such as Budget Administration, interpersonal tasks such as Nondisciplinary Interaction with Students, and instructional tasks such as Curriculum Development Oversight. Using ratings of 1-3 participants indicated the three job responsibilities where they spent most of their time working during an average workday. If participants did not perceive the responsibility as one of the top three responsibilities, the item was scored zero.

In the third section, five open-ended questions were used to collect data about obstacles participants encountered during the entry year, about job assistance they received, and about recommendations for improving the KPIP process. The researcher pilot tested the instrument with 10 administrators who participated in KPIP the prior school year. Feedback was used to make minor revisions in two areas. The researcher clarified the wording of survey instructions and added the item about site-council governance oversight for the purpose of increasing the content validity of work responsibilities to those of Kentucky administrators.

Data Collection Procedures

Names and contact information were provided by the Kentucky Department of Education Division of Testing and Internship in January 1999. Packets containing a questionnaire, a letter explaining the study, and a stamped return envelope were mailed to administrator interns in May 1999. A first and second mailing yielded 97 completed questionnaires and resulted in a return rate of 55%.

Data Analysis

Data related to demographic characteristics, job responsibilities, and assistance data were coded and entered into a computer for processing. Frequencies and percentages were computed. Qualitative data from open-ended questions were coded and categorized for analysis with assistance of an independent researcher who verified the categories.

Results

Demographic Profile

Nearly 65% of subjects had moved directly from a teaching position during the prior year into administration. They averaged having worked 18 years in education prior to their administrative appointment, compared to data from the NAESP study of administrators who averaged working 10 years before moving into administration (Doud & Keller, 1998). Subjects had a mean age of 39.8 years when first hired as administrators compared with the national sample who entered administration at an average age of 36 (Doud & Keller, 1998). Males made up 51 % of participants compared to 58% of participants in the national study.

Most participants worked in rural locations (68%), closely representing the work locations of the general population of administrators in Kentucky. By job-position, 42% were principals and 58% were assistant principals. By level, 47% represented elementary schools, 27% high schools, and 26% middle schools. Due to the fact that Kentucky did not certify administrators at a masters level prior to 1998, the percentage of participants (85%) whose educational level exceeded the masters degree was much higher than the number of participants (43%) from the national study who held higher than a masters degree (Doud & Keller, 1988). Approximately 15% of subjects had a masters degree and 81% had 30+ graduate hours above a masters.

In comparing principals and assistant principals, surprisingly, more Kentucky principals than assistant principals entered administration with less than six years prior work experience in education. Approximately 17% of principals reported less than 6 years prior work experience, whereas only 2% of assistant principals reported less than six years work experience (see Table 2). Additionally, principals reported lower levels of formal education than assistant principals, with 75% of principals holding degrees above the masters and 89% of assistant principals holding degrees above this level. Although a majority of both groups reported being hired directly from teaching positions, 73% of assistant principals moved from teaching while 56% of principals moved from teaching. Few principals had prior building level administrative experience, with only 12% of principals having served as assistant principals. Most

principals (70%) worked in elementary schools, while most assistant principals (84%) worked at middle or high schools. Assistant principals were place-bound in their hiring, with 43% having prior positions in their same schools and 36% having prior positions in their same districts but different schools. Only 21% of assistant principals were hired from outside their districts, compared to 39% of principals being hired from outside their districts.

Insert Table 2 Here

Job Responsibilities

Subjects used ratings of 1-3 to indicate three job responsibilities where they spent most time working during an average day (see Table 3). If subjects did not rank the responsibility as one of the top three, the item was scored zero. Student Discipline and Management was an area reported by 78% of participants as one of the top three job responsibilities. Next, 55% reported that Non-Disciplinary Interaction with Students was a primary responsibility and 52% reported that Supervision of Staff was a primary responsibility. Administrators spent far less time in areas such as a) Curriculum Development (20%), b) Safety and Security Issues (20%), c) Parent and Community Contacts (20%), and d) Student Evaluation and Placement (16%). Table 3 shows the percentages of Kentucky intern assistant principals and principals reporting primary job responsibilities and provides a comparison with reports from principals in the NAESP study.

Insert Table 3 Here

In comparing work of rural, suburban, and urban administrators, only 5% of suburban administrators reported a primary responsibility in curriculum supervision. This was much lower than the 23% of rural and 27% of urban administrators reporting this as a primary area of responsibility. Likewise, more suburban administrators (90%) reported primary responsibilities in disciplining students as

compared to responsibilities of rural (79%) and urban (54%) administrators. Additionally, suburban administrators (30%) reported security and safety as a primary responsibility compared with reports of administrators from rural (19%) and urban (9%) schools.

In comparing responsibilities by level, only 6% of middle school administrators reported that curriculum oversight was a primary responsibility compared to 29% of elementary and 23% of high school administrators. Likewise, more middle school administrators (94%) reported student discipline as a primary responsibility than did elementary (54%) and high school (87%) administrators. Yet, more high school administrators (39%) reported responsibilities for security issues compared to middle (16%) and elementary (10%) school administrators. Responsibilities regarding staff supervision also varied, with only 23% of high school administrators reporting this as a top responsibility compared to 49% of middle and 74% of elementary school administrators.

In comparing gender differences, more male administrators (88%) reported primary responsibilities for disciplining students than did female administrators (68%). Yet, fewer males (6%) than females (15%) reported primary responsibility for student evaluation and placement.

Obstacles Hindering Job Performance

Participants provided 72 discrete responses to the open-ended question, "What was the greatest problem you encountered this year that hindered your job adjustment?" Problems were categorized into four areas: a) problems due to time constraints, b) problems due to personal characteristics of the intern, c) problems with faculty conflict, and d) problems with lack of support from others. Clearly, the greatest obstacle facing interns pertained to time constraints. Nearly, 42% of responses dealt with administrators being overwhelmed by job responsibilities and pressured by time limits. Frequently, administrators indicated they were unable to manage their work demands and struggled to balance personal and family time with professional obligations. Typical frustrations were evident in these statements:

> I only had time to react to problems this year. I don't think I ever had a chance to learn the new job... to think and act strategically on important issues.

I was constantly torn between the needs of my family at home and the requirement to do a good job at work. Both created enormous stress for me.

Nearly, 30% of responses pertained to difficulty in working with staff and teachers. Many responses indicated difficulties administrators experienced by moving into supervisory roles, as evidenced in these comments:

This is a very independent, demanding staff that was used to a "do your own thing" philosophy. They simply had no intention of changing their past practices when I arrived on board.

There was tremendous animosity directed at me from staff members who wanted someone else for my job. It was nearly unbearable!

Obstacles due to individual traits of administrator interns accounted for 17% of the problems listed. These included concerns attributed to lack of administrative experience and certain demographic characteristics of participants:

Several areas caused me problems. My lack of knowledge in areas like shaping teacher attitudes and managing special education was a real concern for me this year.

I was a former teacher at this school. Everyone was looking for me to prove myself as an administrator. This was quite intimidating, and I felt inadequate in my skills.

I am a lot younger than many of our staff members. They still look at me as _____ instead of Mr. _____. This caused me to have confidence problems in my own abilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> Power struggles were a problem for me. I'm younger than 80% of my faculty. I'm new to the district, right out of graduate classes. I thrive on change and discovered quickly that not everyone else operates this way. This was a shock for me.

Finally, problems regarding lack of support from others accounted for 11% of the responses. The political context of administration was evident in these comments:

> Our school board was so ambiguous. Sometimes they were supportive, but more often they were obstinate and served to stand in the way of real progress.

> I simply never felt supported this year. Whenever my supervising principal lacked leadership or failed to follow through with critical issues, I had great problems knowing what to do and felt that I was often ineffective in my role.

Although types of problems varied, many apparently caused administrator interns to question their effectiveness and to experience high levels of job stress and anxiety.

Job Assistance Provided to Interns

Subjects answered three open-ended questions regarding job assistance they received during the entry year. They provided 123 discrete responses to the question, "In what areas did your formal mentor provide you with the most assistance?" (see Table 4). Forms of assistance were categorized into areas representing psychosocial and career assistance functions (Kram, 1985).

In the area of career assistance, interpersonal, curricular, and general management areas were addressed, with 72% of all job assistance listed falling into these areas. Regarding general management functions, mentors assisted interns in Managing Work Time Effectively, Understanding District Policy and Procedures, Managing General Daily Responsibilities, and Managing Fiscal and Budgeting

Responsibilities. Regarding interpersonal functions, mentors assisted interns in Managing and Supervising Faculty and Staff, Managing Parent and Community Relations, and Managing Student Relations. Mentors provided assistance in Managing Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Issues in only 7% of reported cases. Approximately 28% of job assistance reported was categorized into psychosocial functions in two areas: (a) Creating Opportunities for Peer Modeling and Administrative Networking, and (b) Providing Professional and Personal Encouragement and Feedback.

Insert Table 4 Here

Next, participants responded to the question, "What assistance did you receive from others that helped you adjust to your job?" The 78 responses were categorized into three assistance types provided by (a) central office personnel, (b) other administrators, and (c) school personnel. Approximately 53% of responses pertained to positive assistance provided by district personnel. District assistance activities included giving interns opportunities to serve on district committees, to attend professional conferences and workshops, and to receive help in interpreting district policies and practices. Nearly 29% of responses pertained to support provided by supervising principals, assistant principals, and administrators' predecessors. Lastly, 13% of responses pertained to the support provided by nonadministrative personnel. Generally, participants were "taught the ropes" by school staff personnel and were welcomed and socialized by teaching faculty. Few participants gave negative responses (5%) regarding job assistance they received, with negative responses only pertaining to lack of support from district office personnel. Several comments specifically related to district personnel being apathetic about supporting the KPIP process.

Finally, participants responded to the question, "How did KPIP participation enhance your professional growth?" The 64 discrete responses were categorized into five activity areas providing for (a) professional feedback, (b) professional resources, (c) professional networks, (d) self-reflection, and (e) assistance for prioritizing work demands. Approximately, 27% of responses pertained to the value of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

professional feedback provided by KPIP committee members. Numerous responses suggested that interns valued feedback addressing both career and psychosocial assistance, as seen in this comment:

> My interactions during KPIP gave me the opportunity to learn about my strengths and weaknesses. For once I knew the areas of focus for my professional growth. This helped me grow more confident in my abilities throughout the year.

Participants also valued activities that connected them with peers, with 28% of responses pertaining to the importance of interns networking with and shadowing experienced administrators. Nearly 25% of responses dealt with how KPIP committee members served as information resources to interns in areas such as special education and budgeting, as interns reported:

> The KPIP program brought me resources that I may not have had. My committee helped me in areas that I was not prepared for due to my lack of prior administrative experience in special education.

> I was able to gather knowledge from three administrators (on my committee) who had much more experience than I. This resource was invaluable to me during my first year as a principal, especially since I am the only administrator in the building in a very small district.

Nearly 11% of responses pertained to how KPIP activities helped interns prioritize their administrative work. Finally, 9% of responses dealt with how activities created opportunities for self-reflection that had been both encouraged and modeled by KPIP committee members.

Recommendations for Improving the Kentucky Principal Intern Program

Participants provided 48 discrete recommendations for improving KPIP. Recommendations were categorized into five areas of improvement regarding (a) quality of KPIP feedback, (b) the 50-hour

mentoring requirement, (c) the portfolio requirement, (d) assignment of committee members, and (e) program performance standards. Approximately 38% of recommendations dealt with the need to improve the quantity and quality of job performance feedback provided during the KPIP year. Comments included:

> I'd like the communication among the mentor, administrator educator, and me to increase so that I understand more about my particular performance this year.

> I think the program as designed is excellent and could have provided a good source of support for me. Unfortunately, the county that I'm in does not value experiences such as these, and therefore, give them shortshrift. I missed out on potentially valuable feedback. As a result, I lost out.

About 23% of responses recommended that the 50-hour time requirement for out-of-school time spent with the mentor to be reduced. Comments reflected the difficulty interns experienced in managing time required for mentoring activities while juggling work responsibilities as new administrators:

> In my situation, my mentor was in the building. Had he not been so readily available, I would not have been successful. Considering this, for me 50 hours came easily. On the other hand, I know interns who had real difficulties putting in the hours.

> We don't need 50 hours outside of school time. This is ridiculous and insulting. Naturally, you're going to spend a lot of time with the mentor, but 50 hours just puts unneeded stress on the intern. If we keep the 50 hours, it isn't fair that the intern is not paid for the added time.

Some recommendations (17%) dealt with changing the portfolio requirement. Generally, participants indicated that the portfolio requirement lacked structure and took time away from more

important work tasks. Some interns considered the portfolio to be "busy work" and "too demanding of their time". Others voiced that the portfolio was an exercise in "quantity not quality" and that a clear structure for a "more worthwhile" portfolio should be created.

Also, 17% of recommendations dealt with the characteristics and quality of the KPIP committee. Concern over assignment of committee members was an area that surfaced most often in the responses. Some suggestions included that principals be allowed to mentor their own new assistant principals, that university administrator educators be trained and screened more carefully, and that committee members' work experience be aligned more closely to the needs of individual interns. One comment summarized these thoughts:

> We had so many new assistant principals in our district that those who could mentor were spread thinly over the group. I would have benefited more from someone on my own school level- elementary- rather than having to work with a middle school principal who had little knowledge of the primary program.

Finally, 6% of recommendations pertained to changing program expectations for KPIP participants. Some comments dealt with increasing the depth of activities, as evidenced in this comment:

> The program needs more structured activities involving budgeting and other focused areas of running a school.

> As an assistant principal, it was tough to work in the area of instructional leadership. This just isn't my job from day to day. Maybe relook at the requirements for assistant principals in particular.

Limitations

Several limitations of this study exist. The use of self-reported data is both useful and problematic. The researcher collected only administrators' perceptions about job experiences and participation in KPIP. Formal performance evaluation documents were not examined. Data were not collected from mentor principals, other KPIP committee members, or supervisors. Although state laws and official KPIP materials provided helpful knowledge about the program; the study is limited due to its reliance on participants' perceptions as the sole data source. Since this study involved both P-12 assistant principals and principals, caution must be taken in drawing comparisons with K-8 principals represented in the NAESP study (Doud & Keller, 1998).

Discussion

Demographically, Kentucky administrators have similar backgrounds to participants in the national ten-year study. Of concern with this sample, is the fact that 56% of new principals move directly from teaching positions into administration. Many of these principals were hired in elementary schools where they work in isolation from other administrators. As a result, KPIP played an important role in connecting novices to peers who served as models for administrative performance. Due to the fact that these principals had little budget supervision experience or formal leadership experience, the job-embedded assistance provided through KPIP activities was useful in helping novices address many general management tasks. Further research is needed to examine particular needs of principals who enter administration as teachers and how teacher leadership experiences may prepare them for administrative responsibilities.

From this sample, more Kentucky principals than assistant principals entered administration with less than six years prior work experience in education. This indicates that a group of administrators graduating with masters degrees in educational administration are beginning to enter the workforce as Kentucky principals. This group should be tracked carefully over the next several years to determine if their lack of prior work experience or advanced graduate training hinders their performance as new administrators. This demographic trend is likely to continue due to the recent certification changes in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kentucky that move administrator certification from a particular school level (P-6, 5-8, 7-12) at the post-masters level to a generic P-12 certification at the masters level. Prior to this change, Kentucky administrators were required to have a masters in a teaching area and 30 additional hours in administration. The demographic characteristics of Kentucky administrators will change with this new certification regulation. Perhaps, future yearly demographic studies of KPIP participants will be useful in identifying hiring trends regarding age, formal preparation, and work-experience. Universities likely will also experience the trend of younger, less experienced, less educated candidates entering principal preparation programs. These demographic factors may cause changes to be needed in university programs, KPIP requirements, and professional development programs offered for new administrators.

Results show that novice administrators in Kentucky spend little of their day on issues related to curriculum and instruction, areas ranked by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990) as being critical for improving student achievement in schools. These results closely parallel findings of the NASSP study by Doud and Keller (1998). As in the NAESP study, administrators spend little time on planning and conducting staff development. Although the ten-year study included both experienced and inexperienced administrators, participants from both studies reported spending most of their time in the same three areas. By comparing results of the two studies, few differences seem to exist in the way new administrators and experienced administrators spend their workdays.

Of concern is the large number of Kentucky assistant principals who spend most of their time working with student discipline. Several implications exist. First, assistant principals report having difficulty meeting KPIP requirements to address standards in areas such as instructional leadership and school vision building. It is not surprising that assistant principals gain little experience in these areas due to the fact they are burdened by responsibilities of student discipline and supervision. If the assistant principalship is a training ground for excellence in the principalship, assigning assistant principals with responsibilities that exclude student learning and staff improvement is less than desirable. The KPIP internship may be doing little to substantially broaden the work responsibilities of assistant principals.

Unless, assistant principals' work responsibilities are more balanced, administrators may be ill equipped to lead schools in achieving the ambitious goals of the Kentucky Educational Reform Act.

Clearly, issues regarding time constraints and work demands impact new administrators. Since most administrators are hired from teaching positions, many have little knowledge of administrative job pressures. By identifying typical problems that interns encounter, KPIP committee members can help interns manage these difficulties. Although mentors spend extended time with the interns, neither mentors nor other committee members can "observe" all problems that interns face. Mentors and committee members may need additional training in helping interns analyze job challenges and develop strategies for dealing with problems. KPIP mentors who model and reflect with interns on their own job challenges may assist interns in managing problems they encounter.

Overwhelmingly in this study, KPIP was reported as a beneficial support program for interns. This supports earlier work of Petrie et al. (1992) and Wells (1999) and suggests that KPIP is a useful conduit for socializing new administrators. KPIP administrators report that assistance from central office personnel, other administrators, and school personnel is invaluable. These findings support work of succession researchers such as Hart (1993), who report that much of new administrators' socialization to the profession occurs during the first year and that districts play key roles in providing support.

The KPIP program builds on the principles of adult and social learning theories, where adults learn from one another, structure meaning from experience, and grow in their abilities to problem solve (Clark, 1993). From this study, mentors provided extensive assistance in career-related functions regarding school management, and interpersonal areas. Less assistance was provided in student performance areas such as curriculum and instructional oversight. If KPIP is to help administrators meet the challenges of KERA, more focus on developing competences of instructional leadership is needed. Naturally, this requires that job duties of new administrators be structured so that priorities are placed on instructional improvement. Additionally, KPIP mentors and committee members must take seriously their obligation in modeling and developing leadership abilities of interns in areas impacting student learning. This requires mentors and committee members be knowledgeable in effective instructional practices.

Likewise, mentor training can reinforce role expectations for mentors (Krueger & Milstein, 1995). Districts also may analyze their selection process for KPIP mentors and committee members. Although logistically difficult because of large numbers of interns or limited numbers of experienced principal mentors, districts are encouraged to appoint only the "best and most competent" to serve on KPIP committees.

The study supports work of Kram (1985) who reported that the value of mentoring assistance is diminished by negative attitudes of mentors, protégés, and organizational members who have roles in the process. Given the fact that KPIP interns are required to spend many hours with mentors and committee members, optimal matching of protégés with mentors and committee members may be purposeful. Although participants reported KPIP to be valuable, additional studies are needed to identify individual and organizational factors that influence the success of mentoring relationships. Research to investigate the impact that mentoring has on both immediate and delayed work performance is needed if spending on KPIP is to be viewed as a long-term investment in upgrading skills of new administrators. Although general benefits of mentoring are clear, understanding the support needs of interns from underrepresented groups also may be needed. Strengthening career support through KPIP may help increase recruitment and retention of minority administrators in Kentucky. Work to expand findings of Ensher (1997) on the effects of race and gender on mentoring relationships also may be relevant.

Additional research regarding perceptions of other KPIP participants may provide a broader scope of data. Experiences of KPIP mentors, administrator educators, and superintendent designees could be used to analyze the program more in depth. Given that attitudes and skills of committee members are important, work that explores the benefits of KPIP participation for those who serve on KPIP committees is needed. Identifying added incentives for committee member service is needed, given the fact that monetary compensation likely will remain low.

This study supports the notion that mentoring new administrators is not an easy process, due to time constraints, skills and attitudes of mentors, and individualized needs of protégés (Daresh & Playko, 1992). According to Restine (1997), mandatory participation in mentoring, unclear criteria for selecting

and assigning mentors, time constraints, and assessment and evaluation dilemmas are common problems in mentoring programs. Wunsch (1994) characterized several factors that determine success of formal mentoring experiences: a) defining, planning, and structuring the mentoring program, b) selecting and training mentors and proteges, c) obtaining resources for mentoring, and d) evaluating the results of mentoring. The recommendations given by KPIP participants in this study suggest that an improvement model designed using the above components may be useful in comprehensively evaluating KPIP after a decade of implementation. Program evaluation results may reveal policy implications regarding mentor assignment, the dual nature (formative/ summative) of the KPIP process, and program requirements. The recommendation from this sample mirrors a similar recommendation from a study by Wells (1999) that the 50-hour time requirement overwhelms many interns and adds to their burden of adjusting to new jobs. Although an hour limit may be needed, it may be that time spent during the school day is more important in assisting interns in action. Naturally, options regarding this recommendation need more exploration before program adjustments are made.

Results of the study may be useful in redesigning preservice administrator training. Supporting findings of Daresh & Playko (1992), this study suggests that traditional preservice practices such as internships and field-experiences, though helpful, may only provide aspiring administrators with a glimpse into technical aspects of administration with little attention given to the contextual nature of the job. Results speak to collaboration among districts, schools, and universities, regarding administrator preparation and support (Daresh & Playko, 1992). The value of job coaching and mentoring as identified by this study, suggests that these experiences may be of value earlier in preservice preparation and later beyond an administrators' first year of employment. With the adoption of new administrator standards from ISLLC, understanding the impact and application of the standards on KPIP is needed. Finally and perhaps most important, research is needed to determine if participation in KPIP actually improves the quality of leadership in Kentucky schools.

Induction programs such as KPIP and those in other states mandate both job-embedded support and performance accountability for new administrators. According to Daresh & Playko (1992), these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

programs have great promise, but generally have not achieved their full potential. The current study supports this contention. More studies that investigate benefits of mandated induction programs are needed. Being the first of its kind, KPIP has been operational for over a decade and was designed before passage of the Kentucky Educational Reform Act. With revision, perhaps its impact could serve as a model for leadership induction that prioritizes student performance-orientation over school management-orientation.

References

Anderson, M. (1989). Training and selecting school leaders. In Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed.), School leadership: Handbook for excellence. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Clark, M. C. (1993). Transformational learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), An update on adult learning theory (pp. 47-56). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1992). The professional development of school administrators: Preservice, induction, and inservice applications. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1992, April). What do beginning leaders need? Aspiring and practicing principals' perceptions of critical skills for novice administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1998). A ten-year study: The K-8 principal in 1998. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals

Ensher, E. A., & Murphy, S. E. (1997). Effects of race, gender, perceived similarity and contact on mentor relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50, 460-481.

Hart, A. W. (1993). Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kentucky Administrative Regulations. (1998). 704 KAR 20:470.

Kentucky Department of Education (1999). Kentucky Principal Internship Program Handbook. Frankfort, KY: Office of Teacher Education and Certification.

Kentucky Department of Education (1998). Kentucky Principal Intern Program 1997-98: Survey Results. Frankfort, KY: Office of Teacher Education and Certification

Knowles, M. (1988). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy. Cambridge, MA: The Adult Education Co.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Krueger, J. A., & Milstein, M. M. (1995). Promoting excellence in educational leadership: What really matters? Planning and Changing, 26, 148-167.

Levine, S. L., (1982). Promoting adult growth in schools: The promise of professional development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. B. (1999). Educational administration: A decade of reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990). Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification. Fairfax, VA: Author.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41, 457-479.

Petrie, G., White, E., Wallman, D., & Prickett, R. (1992). Kentucky principal intern program evaluation report 1990-92. Bowling Green, KY: The Consortium for Educational Administration, Western Kentucky University.

Playko, M. A. (1990). What it means to be mentored. NASSP Bulletin, 65-69.

Prickette, R. L. et al. (1990). Opportunities for success: Kentucky's Beginning Principal Intern Program. ERIC Document ED 342115.

Restine, N. (1997). Learning and development in the context of leadership development. Peabody Journal of Education, 72, 117-130.

Wells, Z. (1999). Kentucky's induction-year internship for principals and assistant principals: 1997-98 demographics and job responsibilities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Wunsch, M. A. (1994). Developing mentoring programs: Major themes and issues. In Wunsch, M. A. (Ed.), Mentoring revisited: Making an impact on individuals and institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Population of KPIP Administrator Interns and Subjects Returning Questionnaire

	Population (N = 176)			Participants (n = 97)		
School Level	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Elementary	21 (23%)	46 (55%)	67 (38%)	15 (30%)	23 (49%)	38 (39%)
Middle	32 (35%)	16 (19%)	48 (27%)	19 (38%)	14 (30%)	33 (34%)
High	39 (42%)	22 (26%)	61 (35%)	16 (32%)	10 (21%)	26 (27%)
Total	92 (100%)	84 (100%)	176 (100%)	50 (100%)	47 (100%)	97 (100%)

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects Classified by Job Title

	Principal Intern (n = 41)	Assistant Principal Intern (n = 56)
Mean Age	39.7 Years Old	39.9 Years Old
Gender	44% Male	57% Male
Highest Educational Level		
	25% held Masters Degree	11% held Masters Degree
	73% held Post Masters Rank I	84% held Post Masters Rank I
	2% held Doctorate Degree	5% held Doctorate Degree
Years Working in Education Prior to Administrative Appointment		
	17% 0-5 Years	2% 0-5 Years
	12% 6-10 Years	34% 6-10 Years
	42% 11-15 Years	36% 11-15 Years
	29% >16 Years	29% >16 Years
Prior Work Location Hired From		
	34% Same School	43% Same School
	27% Different School / Same District	36% Different School / Same District
	37% Different District In State	20% Different District in State
	2% Different State	1% Different State
Prior Position Before Appointment to Administrative Position		
	56% Teacher	73% Teacher
	13% Counselor	18% Counselor
	12% Assistant Principal	0% Assistant Principal
	5% Principal	0% Principal
	14% District Position	8% District Position
School Level		
	70% Elementary	16% Elementary
	15% Middle	48% Middle
	15% High	36% High
School Location		
	78% Rural	61% Rural
	12% Suburban	27% Suburban
	10% Urban	12% Urban
School Size		
	25% < 250 Students Enrolled	2% < 250 Student Enrolled
	34% 251-500 Students Enrolled	7% 251-500 Students Enrolled
	34% 501-750 Student Enrolled	45% 501-750 Students Enrolled
	7% > 751 Students Enrolled	46% > 751 Students Enrolled

Table 3

Job Responsibilities Indicated as First, Second, or Third in Priority

	Kentucky Sample			NAESP Sample
Job Responsibility	Total	Assistant Principals	Principals	Principals
Discipline and Student Management	78%	95%	56%	61%
Nondisciplinary Interaction with Students	55%	57%	51%	65%
Supervision and Contact with Staff	52%	39%	68%	81%
Duties Assigned by Central Office	21%	21%	20%	9%
Safety and Security Issues	20%	20%	20%	8%
Parent and Community Contacts	20%	22%	17%	25%
Curriculum Development Oversight	20%	11%	32%	11%
Student Evaluation and Placement	16%	16%	15%	11%
Facilities Management	10%	5%	17%	17%
Other Duties Not Listed	4%	7%	0%	41%
Budget Administration	3%	3%	3%	5%
Planning/Conducting Staff Development	2%	4%	0%	6%
Site-Based Council Responsibilities	1%	0%	2%	---
Interaction with Central Staff	0%	0%	0%	6%

Note. Dash indicates that data were not collected from subjects.

Table 4

Areas of Job Assistance Provided by Formal Mentors

Areas of Job Assistance	n	%
Managing and Supervising Faculty and Staff	20	16%
Opportunities for Peer Modeling and Administrative Networking	19	15%
Professional and Personal Encouragement	16	13%
Managing Work Time Effectively	13	12%
Understanding District Policy and Procedures	11	9%
Managing General Daily Responsibilities	11	9%
Managing Parent and Community Relations	10	8%
Managing Fiscal and Budgeting Responsibilities	9	7%
Managing Curriculum and Instructional Issues	8	7%
Managing Student Relations	5	4%
Total	123	100%